

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 6, 11, 13-18 are pending in this application. Claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12 are cancelled and claims 13-18 have been added by amendment filed on 03/24/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Regarding claims 1, 6, and 11, the claim recites in line 22 “ passed through about at least one notification request” as related to the second information does not clearly state what the second notification is passing through. For examination purposes the limitation will be considered as the second information to be passed through at least one of each of the upstream computers that had requested a notification in addition to a notification request of progress information to be reported to said one of the series of computers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1, 6, 11, 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shastri (Pub # US 2002/0065918 A1, hereinafter Shastri).**

7. With respect to claims 1, 6, and 11, Shastri discloses a service processing method, apparatus, and program product used in a computer system comprising a series of computers ([0012], lines 7-8, [0013], lines 4-10), each of which receives a message ([0013], lines 8-10, [0017], lines 1-14), executes an individual service based on the received message ([0013], lines 1-10, [0017], lines 1-14), and then outputs at least one message generated from the result of the execution ([0045], lines 1-15), said computer system realizing a series of services in a coordinated manner ([0013], lines 1-4, [0017], lines 1-4) by transmitting and receiving the message along the series of computers ([0045], lines 1-15), said method implemented in one of the series of computers, said method comprising the steps of: receiving from a preceding upstream computer a message including first information about a service execution request from

the preceding upstream computer (fig. 5, [0057], lines 1-2, [0058], lines 1-2, Job J1-Jn), and second information about at least one notification request of progress information issued from each upstream computer ([0017], lines 12-14, progress information is part of J1-Jn); executing said individual service according to the first information ([0057], lines 1-4); analyzing the second information, and after that, based on the execution result of the individual service, generating at least one message according to the second information, and then transmitting the generated message to each of the upstream computers that is identified by a destination of progress information notification included in each notification request the second information ([0045], lines 1-10, [0037], lines 11-15, [0074], lines 6-7), the methods and roles of the base station can be implemented by the server hence each server is able to send out jobs and receive what is requested); and transmitting to each following downstream computer a message including a service execution request for the following downstream computer ([0054], lines 9-13, [0057], lines 1-4), and the second information to be passed through about at least one notification request from each of the upstream computers in addition to a notification request of progress information to be reported to said one of the series of computers ([0017], lines –14, [0022], lines 1-9, [0037], lines 11-15).

8. With respect to claims 13, 15, and 17, Shastri discloses wherein said notification request in the second information includes a hierarchical level indicating the extent of downstream level to which the most upstream computer requests the notification of progress information ([0017], line 1-14, [0018], lines 1-9, [0044], lines 1-9), and said one

of the series of computers decreases the hierarchical level by a decrement and passes the notification request to the following downstream computer unless the received hierarchical level has reached a limit value in the extent ([0017], line 1-14, [0044], lines 1-9).

9. With respect to claims 14, 16, and 18, Shastri discloses wherein said notification request in the second information includes a degree of details in which detail the most upstream computer expects the progress information to be returned ([0015], lines 1-8, [0016], lines 1-6, [0037], lines 11-15).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments, with regards to claims 1, 6, and 11, filed 03/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. On page 10 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 1, 6, and 11, applicant's argue that Shastri does not disclose a method, apparatus, or a computer program product.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments since in [0042], Shastri discloses that Job objects are, in a preferred embodiment, executable program lists that provide instructions to servers. Shastri also discloses in [0079], methods and apparatus of the present invention.

12. On page 11 and 14 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 1, 6, and 11, applicant's argue that Shastri does not disclose receiving from a preceding upstream computer a message including first information about a service execution request from the preceding upstream computer, and a second information about at least one notification request of progress information issued from each upstream computer.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments since in Fig. 5, [0057], [0058], [0017], and Job objects are sent from S1 to S5. S5 receives the Job objects from S1 which is a preceding upstream computer. While S5 received the Job objects, the Job object contains in part (e), notifying the client content provider by the base server of progress and completion of the job according to the job object. Hence, the second information which requested progress information was already in the Job object that S5 received from S1.

13. On page 13 and 14 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 1, 6, and 11, applicant's argue that Shastri does not disclose analyzing the second information, generating at lest one message according to the second information, based on the execution result of the individual service, and then transmitting the generated message to each of the upstream computers that is identified by a destination of progress information notification included in each notification request of the second information..

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments since in [0045] [0037], and [0074], Shastri discloses monitoring job progress (analyzing the second information). Shastri also discloses that the servers can act independently of Base

station. In addition, Shastri discloses in [0074], that the base station (which is capable of being a server) is receiving final notifications from servers. After wards, it sends a report to the client that final commands are still in progress or new and not yet in progress, or if a server has failed. In [0078], Shastri discloses that jobs may initiate with a client which means that the client can also be the one sending the job objects which is also known as an upstream computer in this case.

14. On page 13, 14, and 15 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 1, 6, and 11, applicant's argue that Shastri does not disclose transmitting to each following downstream computer a message including a service execution request for the following downstream computer, and the second information to be passed through about at least one notification request from each of the upstream computers in addition to a notification request of progress information to be reported to said one of the series of computers.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments since Shastri discloses in [0037] and [0022], that the each server can function independently of the base station meaning that it can implement roles of the base station. With that in mind, Shastri discloses in [0022] transmitting the status of completing the job and progress made (information request and also the additional progress information request) back to the server that the job was passed from (upstream computer). Since any server can implement the roles of the base station, the server is able to report back to the client which is one of the series of computer since the jobs can be initiated by the client as

stated in [0078]

15. On page 16 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 13, 15, and 17, applicant's argue that Shastri does not disclose where the notification request includes a hierarchical level indicating the extent of downstream level to which the most upstream computer requests the notification of progress information.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments since Shastri discloses in [0017], and [0018], that element b in the job object specifies a server list of all servers to which media content is to be streamed which is the hierarchical level indicating how many downstream computers will be needed [0018]. In such, the hierarchical level is included in the job object along with the notification of progress information. While the most upstream computer (client, server, or base station) forwards the job object to the next downstream computer according to element b respectively until the completion of the job, Shastri's system also provides that the progress information will be received by the first client/server/base station who initiated the job object in order to appropriately generate another message the status of the overall completion and progress to an appropriate client/server/base station.

16. On page 16 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 14, 16, and 18, applicant's argue that Shastri does not disclose where the notification request includes a degree of details in which detail the most upstream computer expects the progress information to be retuned.

Art Unit: 2157

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments since Shastri discloses in [0017] a job object which is degree of details about a server. In addition, in element e of the job object, Shastri discloses notification of progress as one of the details. Shastri also discloses that it will keep on monitoring each and every server until status notification has been received from all the servers. With that in mind, Shastri expects that the progress information of element e in the job object to be returned with information of any kind notifying if it has been completed, still performing, or an error occurred.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HO SHIU whose telephone number is (571)270-3810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (8:30am - 4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

June 17, 2008
HTS

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157

Ho Ting Shiu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2157